

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant : Shinya Adachi, et al.
Appln. No. : 10/075,208
Filed : February 14, 2002
Title : METHOD FOR TRANSMITTING LOCATION INFORMATION ON
A DIGITAL MAP, APPARATUS FOR IMPLEMENTING THE METHOD
AND TRAFFIC INFORMATION PROVISION/RECEPTION SYSTEM

Conf. No. : 7063
Art Unit : 3663
Examiner : Tuan C. To

Customer No. : 116
Docket No. : 34409

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE "I"

Sir:

This communication is filed in response to the Office Action dated August 22, 2007 (Paper No. 20061228). The three-month period for responding to the Office Action expires on November 22, 2007.

The following remarks are made for the Examiner's consideration.

Remarks begin on page 2 of this paper.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-3, 10, 11, 18-25 and 37-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a), (b) and (e) as being anticipated by Ito et al. For the following reasons, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding claim 1, Ito does not disclose relative data indicating said on-road location of an event in said road section. The Office Action states that Ito discloses the relative data, which is the distance data from a specific point. However, the relative data disclosed in Ito is the distance between the departure point and the destination (Ito, column 11, lines 40-41) or the road length included in the road database (Ito, column 17, lines 39-40). Ito's data are not data indicating the on-road location of an event in a road section. Also, Ito does not disclose the use of said relative data to identify the on-road location of the event in said road section. Ito only discloses the map matching by comparing the road data with the traveling trace of a vehicle to display the current position of the vehicle (Ito, column 19, line 47 to column 20, line 12). Therefore, since every limitation of claim 1 is not taught by the reference, claim 1 is not fully anticipated by Ito. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection as it applies to claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2 and 3 which are dependent from claim 1 should also be allowable for at least the same reason. Also, regarding claim 3, Ito does not disclose the use of distance data as said relative data. The road length disclosed in Ito is not used as relative data, but as road data (Ito, column 17, line 40).

Regarding claims 10, 19, 37, 38 and 42, Ito does not disclose that an information provider transmits on-road location information of an event. Ito only discloses transmitting information relating the location of a vehicle. Therefore, since every limitation of claims 10, 19, 37 and 38 is

not taught by the reference, claims 10, 19, 37, 38 and 42 are not fully anticipated by Ito. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection as it applies to claims 10, 19, 37, 38 and 42 is respectfully requested.


Claims 11 and 18, 20-25 and 43, and 39-41 which are dependent from claims 10, 19 and 38, respectively should be allowable for at least the same reason.

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit
Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. NGB-34409 .

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: 
Nobuhiko Sukenaga, Reg. No. 39446

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: October 31, 2007